

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, completion of the personal interview on September 12, 2006. The Examiner's observations are appreciated, and have been incorporated into the subject response.

By way of review, the subject application teaches a system whereby document processing operations by dissimilar devices will result in uniform or standardized messages to reflect a status of the device. Common network environments will frequently involve devices, such as printers, from various manufactures. Different devices will frequently generate their own status indicator representative of a state of the device or a status of a document processing operation. This often results in confusion to a user, since a message generated from one device may appear different than that generated from a different device, even though both messages may be referring to a similar aspect. The subject application teaches a mechanism by which a controller associated with each document processing device is identified, and messages resultant from each controller are output in a mutually consistent manner.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10 12 and 14 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,456 to Teng. Claims 3, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Teng in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,618 to Eylon. Claims 7, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Teng in view of Clough.


Teng is directed to a system by which print jobs are submitted via HTTP to a printer having a URL. Teng also notes incorporating printer status or error information into a HTML page for reporting. However, Teng functions to merely relay information relative to printer status. Teng does not contemplate, nor teach a solution for, non-uniform messages being generated for similar events from dissimilar printers. During the interview, the Applicants noted that the discussed embodiments were unique relative to translation of a uniform message from different devices. The Examiner suggested that the distinctions would be made more clear by reflecting, in the base claims, that multiple printers were operable concurrently, with conversion by each printer's message being made to a predetermined type of notification. The Examiner's observations are appreciated, and have been incorporated in to each of independent claims 1, 4 and 5. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10 12 and 14 are in condition for allowance over Teng.

The deficiencies of Teng are not remedied by any teachings of Eylon, which is cited for teaching of a dynamic link library, or Clough, which is cited for teaching of use of conventional Internet protocols or proprietary protocols for printing in a networked system. Accordingly, all remaining claims are also in condition for allowance over the art of record. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/14562.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept 18, 2006



John X. Garred
Registration No. 31,830
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3340
Fax: (216) 592-5009